

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-53 are currently pending. Claims 1-3, 12-15, 18, 23-25, 34-37, and 40 have been amended by the present amendment. The changes to the claims are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-3, 8, 12, 23-25, 31, 34, 45, 46, 50, and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,219,694 to Lazaridas et al. (hereinafter “the ‘694 patent”); Claims 4, 9, 10, 13-15, 26, 27, 32, 35-37, 48, and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘694 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,136 to Kuwabara (hereinafter “the ‘136 patent”); Claims 5-7, 11, 16, 17, 27-30, 33, 38, 39, and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘694 and ‘136 patents, further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,951,636 to Zerber (hereinafter “the ‘636 patent”); Claims 18-22 and 40-44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the ‘694 patent; and Claims 47, 49, and 53 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘694 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,108,492 to Miyachi (hereinafter “the ‘492 patent”).

Amended Claim 1 is directed to a method of processing messages, comprising:

(1) receiving an electronic mail message by a computer; (2) determining whether a content of the received message is for a user of the computer or for an attached device associated with the computer by detecting a characteristic of the message, the attached device being a business office device including a processor; (3) transmitting a communication from the computer to the attached device, if the determining step determines that the received message is for the attached device; and (4) operating the processor of the attached device in response

to the communication. The changes to Claim 1 are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.²

The ‘694 patent is directed to a system and method for pushing information from a host system to a mobile communication device having a shared electronic address with the host system. As shown in Figure 1, the ‘694 patent discloses a system in which certain user defined event triggers are activated and messages or commands are redirected from a desktop computer to a mobile communications device. In particular, as shown in Figure 4, regarding incoming email messages, if the messages are to be redirected by the redirector 12, the message is repackaged by placing an outer wrapper around the original message before sending to the mobile device.³ However, Applicants respectfully submit that the ‘694 patent fails to disclose determining whether a content of the received message is for a user of the computer or for an attached device associated with the computer by detecting a characteristic of the message, as recited in Claim 1. Rather, the ‘694 patent discloses that *all of the incoming email messages are for the user*, but that the user may effectively set up a filter for filtering out those messages that should not be sent to the mobile device. Thus, the ‘694 patent merely discloses a system used to filter out messages to be sent to a mobile data communication device, based on the limited bandwidth available to send messages to the mobile device. Further, Applicants submit that the ‘694 patent fails to disclose determining whether a content of a received message is for an attached device. Rather, the ‘694 patent discloses a wireless system. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 1 (and dependent Claims 3, 8, 12, 45, and 46) as anticipated by the ‘694 patent is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 1.

Independent Claim 23 recites limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claim 1. Moreover, Claim 23 has been amended in a manner analogous to the amendment to Claim

² See, e.g., Figure 14 and the discussion in the specification related thereto.

³ See, e.g., the ‘694 patent, column 10, line 39 - column 11, line 5.

1. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 23 (and all similarly rejected dependent claims) as anticipated by the ‘694 patent is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 23.

Regarding the rejection of dependent Claims 4-7, 9-11, 13-15, 26-30, 32, 33, 35-39, 47, 48, and 52, Applicants respectfully submit that the ‘136 and ‘636 patents fail to remedy the deficiencies of the ‘694 patent, as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of the above-identified dependent claims is rendered moot by the present amendment to independent Claims 1 and 23.

Claim 18 is directed to a method of transmitting, comprising: (1) transmitting information from a device to a computer associated with the device, the device being a business office device including a processor; (2) processing the information by a device driver within the computer; and (3) transmitting, by the computer, an electronic mail message corresponding to the information. Claim 18 has been amended to clarify that the device driver is configured to control operations of the device. The changes to Claim 18 are supported by the originally filed specification and do not add new matter.⁴

As discussed above, the ‘694 patent is directed to a system and method for pushing information from a host system to a mobile data communication device having a shared electronic address with the host system. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the ‘694 patent fails to disclose processing the information by a device driver within the computer, wherein the device driver is configured to control operations of the device, as recited in amended Claim 18. The redirector 12 disclosed by the ‘694 patent is not configured to control operations of the mobile device. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 18 (and dependent Claims 19-22) as anticipated by the ‘694 patent is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 18.

⁴ See, e.g., Figures 9 and 10 and the discussion related thereto in the specification.

Claim 40 recites limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claim 18.

Moreover, Claim 40 has been amended in a manner analogous to the amendment to Claim 18. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 18, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 40 (and dependent Claims 41-44) are rendered moot by the present amendment to Claim 40.

Regarding the rejection of dependent Claims 47, 49, and 53 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Applicants respectfully submit that the '492 patent fails to remedy the deficiencies of the '694 patent, as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of dependent Claims 47, 49, and 53 is rendered moot by the present amendment to Claims 1, 18, and 40.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 18, 23, and 40 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over any proper combination of the '694, '136, '636, and '492 patents.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Kurt M. Berger
James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648
Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51,461

JJK:KMB\la